APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,965	03/30/2001	Lev Brouk	GRCN001/03US	3908

22434	7590	10/26/2004

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER
ZHONG, CHAD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

DATE MAILED: 10/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _30 March 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-34_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-34_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/10/02 4/12/02

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-34 are presented for examination.

2.   It is noted that although the present application does contain line numbers in specification and

claims, the line numbers in the claims do not correspond to the preferred format. The preferred format is

to number each line of every claim, with each claim beginning with line 1. For ease of reference by both

the Examiner and Applicant all future correspondence should include the recommended line numbering.

4.   The use of the trademark Oracle, SAP, PeopleSoft among others have been noted in this

application (pg 2, for example). It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the

generic terminology. Appropriate correction is required on the entire specification and appendix.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

   A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

   (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United
   States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has
   fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 (c) of this title before the invention thereof by
   the applicant for patent.

6.   Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bowman-Amuah

(hereinafter Bowman), US 2003/0058277.

7.   As per claim 1, Bowman teaches a message routing method, comprising:

        (a) invoking a first service during a logical routing of a message in a message routing network, said

first service invocation having a first context; and

        (b) invoking a second service during said logical routing of said message in said message routing

network, said second service invocation having a second context that is defined at least in part by said

first service (pg 5, [0164]; pg 127, [3346]; pg 139, [3635]; pg 149, [3821], [3814], [3829], [3836-3837];

Bowman discusses remote method invocation [hereinafter RMI], RMI inherently allows remote

invocation of methods in between two nodes in the network, i.e. between client and a server. Claim 1

deals with plurality of invocations wherein the second invocation is related in first invocation. In the

sections cited in Bowman, a single work unit has the possibility of involving multiple invocations on

another node in the network wherein the invocations are interrelated towards a particular task but

involving various contexts).

8.   As per claim 2, Bowman teaches the message routing method of claim 1, wherein a context to an

invocation includes an identity of an invoker service (pg 16, [0460]; pg 141, [3685]).

9.   As per claim 3, Bowman teaches the message routing method of claim 1, wherein a context to an

invocation includes arguments to an invoked service (pg 177; pg 151).

10.   As per claim 4, Bowman teaches the message routing method of claim 1, wherein a context to an

invocation includes a session identifier for said message (pg 42, [1203]; pg 49, [1434]; pg 63, [1930]).

11.   As per claim 5, Bowman teaches the message routing method of claim 1, wherein a context to an

invocation includes a topic for said message (pg 45, [1313]; pg 43, [1253]; pg 33, [0920]).

12.   As per claim 6, Bowman teaches the message routing method of claim 1, wherein a context to an

invocation includes billing responsibility for said invocation (pg 2, [0059]; pg 66, [2010]).

13.   As per claim 7, Bowman teaches the message routing method of claim 1, wherein said message

routing network controls at least part of an invocation (pg 5, [0164]; pg 127, [3346]; pg 139, [3635]; pg

149, [3821]).

14.   As per claim 8, Bowman teaches the message routing method of claim 1, wherein a context of an

invocation is included at least in part in a header element of a message (pg 141, [3685]).

15.   As per claim 9, Bowman teaches the message routing method of claim 1, wherein a context of an

invocation is included at least in part in a body element of a message (pg 141, [3685]).

16.   As per claim 10, Bowman teaches the message routing method of claim 1, wherein a context of

an invocation is included at least in part in an attachment of a message (pg 141, [3685]).

17.   As per claim 11, Bowman teaches the message routing method of claim 1, further comprising

restoring said context, upon return from said second service invocation, to said first context (pg 11,

[0333]; pg 62, [1910]; pg 170, [4317]).

18.   As per claim 12, Bowman teaches the message routing method of claim 1, further comprising

adding a returned context from said second service invocation to said restored context (pg 170, [4317-

4318]).

19.   As per claim 13, claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 1 above.

20.   As per claim 14, Bowman teaches a message routing system, comprising:

        a message routing network that enables message routing between a plurality of services, wherein said

routing is based on a logical routing of said message that is effected through a sequence of invocations

among said plurality of services, wherein a context of an invocation is defined at least in part by an

invoking service, wherein upon return from a service invocation, said message routing network restores a

message context to a context state of an invoking service of said service invocation (pg 170, [4318],

[4317], and same rejection as rejection to claim 1 above.).

21.   As per claim 15, claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 8 above.

22.   As per claim 16, Bowman teaches the message routing system of claim 14, wherein a context to

an invocation includes an identity of an invoker service (pg 15, [0448]; pg 16, [0460]; pg 33, [0926]).

23.   As per claim 17, Bowman teaches the message routing system of claim 14, wherein a context to

an invocation includes arguments to an invoked service (pg 151, pg 177).

24.   As per claims 18-21, claims 18-21 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 4-7

above respectively.

25.   As per claim 22, Bowman teaches the message routing system of claim 14, wherein said logical

routing occurs prior to a physical routing of a message (pg 117, [3157]; pg 119, [3199]; pg 123, [3287];

pg 38, [1077]).

26.   As per claim 23, Bowman teaches the message routing system of claim 14, wherein at least part

of said logical routing occurs after initiation of a physical routing of a message (pg 38, [1078]; pg 73,

[2193]).

27.   As per claim 24, Bowman teaches the message routing system of claim 14, wherein physical

routing of a message occurs at identified points during said logical routing (pg 117, [3157]; pg 119,

[3199]; pg 123, [3287]; pg 38, [1077]).

28.   As per claims 25-27, claims 25-27 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 8-10

above respectively.

29.   As per claim 28, Bowman teaches a message routing method, comprising:

        (a) invoking a first service that receives only logical delivery of an application message, said

application message received over a public network, wherein said first service invocation has a first

context defined at least in part by a first invoking service (pg 117, [3157]; pg 119, [3199]; pg 123, [3287];

pg 38, 1077);

        (b) invoking a second service, said second service invocation having a second context that is defined

at least in part by said first service, wherein said second service invocation is managed by a message

routing network on behalf of said first service; and

        (c) delivering said message having said second context to said second service over said public

network (parts b and c of claim 28 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 1 above).

30.   As per claim 29-34, claims 29-34 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 1, 8, 2-6

above respectively.

Conclusion

31.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to

"System And Method For Outing Messages Between Applications".

        i.   US 6529489   Kikuchi et al.

        ii.   US 5255389   Wang

iii.   US 5333312   Wang

iv.   US 6091714   Sensel et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0718. The examiner can normally be

reached on M-F 7am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John

A Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238

for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should

be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CZ
July 9, 2004

Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner